MENANDER'S OLD MEN

W. THOMAS MacCARY
University of Texas

The parts played by old men in Menander[1] are extremely important to the structure of the plays: almost all Menandrean comedies whose plots are clear from extant fragments end in the marriage of young people, and old men tend either to stand as a barrier to this marriage, or to give assistance to the young lover, or to appear as a sort of *deus ex machina*, at the last minute, to make the marriage possible through recognition or financial support. The first type of old man, the barrier type, is well-represented among the fragments and deserves particular attention in that he often emerges as the most interesting character in his play even though he opposes the movement of the comedy toward its goal: through some sort of perversity he places himself between the young lovers, and the intrigues and reversals of the plot focus on his removal. In other plays he is not so interesting, but simply a father who gets in the way.

The other two types of old man—the friend and confidant of the young lover, and the *deus ex machina* type—are both instrumental in solving the problems of the plays in which they appear. The former is instrumental in removing the barrier between the lover and his mistress, while the latter usually appears only after most of the difficulties of the play have been resolved, late in the fourth act or

[1] These, unlike the other comic types—on which H. J. Mette, *Lustrum* 10 (1965) 119 ff. gives bibliography—have been treated only in the context of larger or related studies, such as F. Wehrli, *Motivstudien zur griechischen Komödie* (Zurich 1936), "Die Vater-Sohn Rivalität" (56 ff.), "Die Prellung des Vaters" (70 ff.); G. Duckworth, *The Nature of Roman Comedy* (Princeton 1952), "Senex" (242 ff.); and T. B. L. Webster, *Studies in Menander*[2] (Manchester 1960), *passim*. Abbreviated references are Austin = C. Austin, *Menandri Aspis et Samia* I, II (Berlin 1969–70); Kassel = R. Kassel, *Menandri Sicyonius* (Berlin 1965); Körte = A. Körte, A. Thierfelder, *Menandri quae supersunt*[3] (Leipzig 1957–59); Turner = E. G. Turner, "Menander: Misoumenos," *Oxyrhynchus Papyri* XXXIII (London 1968).

early in the fifth, when the identity of the young girl must be established so that she can be legally married. Both are interesting primarily in relation to their children rather than for any purely personal trait.

It has been established elsewhere that certain of Menander's characters are consistent by name and role throughout the corpus, i.e., they appear in play after play showing the same characteristics: Moschion always tries to rape a free-born girl; Gorgias is always a rustic young man of strong character; Myrrhine is always a matron;[2] Parmeno is always a dutiful but querulous slave, while Daos, also a slave, is imaginative but ineffective.[3] The most obvious example of this phenomenon among the old men is Smikrines, who is definitely a miser in both the *Aspis* and the *Epitrepontes*, and probably had the same trait in three other plays. Some characters are unique, appearing in only one play; all Menander's soldiers seem to be in this category,[4] as is Knemon. Since such consistency, or lack thereof, is important to the interpretation of a character for each play in which he appears, all characters of the same name should be considered together.

Finally, after examining each role in the context of its play and in relation to other roles in other plays by Menander, one should be in a position to comment on the range of characterization among his old men and to compare this range to that of other poets of the Greek New Comedy and to Plautus and Terence. Here there is special interest in the kinds and degrees of perversity which Menander displays in his barrier types: how are their points of view related to the dominant ideas in the plays? This is particularly important in confrontations of fathers and sons and one wants to know exactly how Menander differs from his Greek contemporaries and Roman successors in depicting this sort of battle between youth and age so prevalent in all comedy.

The most thorough and best-received analysis of the *Dyskolos*, the only play in which Knemon appears, is that of A. Schäfer,[5] which focuses on the problem central to any interpretation, the relation between the characterization of Knemon and the structure of the play. Schäfer warns against considering Knemon a character in the modern

[2] W. T. MacCary, "Menander's Characters," *TAPA* 101 (1970) 277 ff.
[3] W. T. MacCary, "Menander's Slaves," *TAPA* 100 (1969) 277 ff.
[4] W. T. MacCary, "Menander's Soldiers," *AJP* 93 (1972).
[5] A. Schäfer, *Menanders Dyskolos* (Meisenheim 1965).

sense of that term—*in Sinne einer entwichelteren Psychologie neu definiert und entsprechend individuell geformte Gestalten*—but does see Knemon as approaching this definition toward the end of the play.[6] Herein lies the great flaw of the play, according to Schäfer: Knemon is a stereotypical misanthrope in the first three acts of the *Dyskolos* when the audience is concerned with the romantic intrigue, but in the last two acts Knemon emerges as the major interest in the play and thus there is a certain shift in the resolution of the plot. This is an accurate but prejudicial account of the play's movement and Knemon's role in it. What happens in the *Dyskolos* is simply that in the removal of the barrier to the young people's marriage—the barrier is Knemon and he removes himself in his *apologia* of the fourth act (702 ff.)—one is made aware of the validity of a feeling that has built up in the earlier portion of the play: the young people involved, with the exception of Gorgias, are really of no interest in comparison with the old man—Chaireas and Knemon's daughter are simply cameo roles—which leaves Sostratos.

Sostratos is the worst sort of young man in love—helpless, frightened, stupid. Some of Menander's finest comedy is written in the contrast between the actual situation in the play and Sostratos' interpretation of it, as when he says, "One need never give up altogether on a project if he only take stock of the situation: all things can be gained through foresight and hard work. I myself am an example of this, in that today I have accomplished a marriage which no one would have thought possible" (860–65). This is the sort of gnomic utterance for which Menander is famous; yet, in the context of the play one cannot take it seriously[7] since Pan, the Nymphs and Gorgias are responsible for Knemon's acquiescence in the marriage; Sostratos has been literally a spectator at the arrangement of his own future. It is not that Knemon, late in the play, replaces Sostratos as the main character of the play, but rather that Knemon gradually fills the vacuum which the non-hero Sostratos has left. One then feels a tension in the final scenes between the ever-powerful wish to see the comic promise kept—a

[6] *Ibid.* 91 ff.

[7] Cf. "He whom the gods love dies young," said contemptuously by a slave to his master in the *Dis Exapaton* (= Plautus, *Bacchides* 816 f.), and "There is nothing of interest to any man which I do not consider of interest to myself," said by a busybody in the *Heauton Timoroumenos* (= Terence, *Heauton Timoroumenos* 77).

marriage will take place, although it is between people in whom there is only marginal interest—and the tremendous respect one has built up, throughout the play, for the barrier figure.

This is a strange phenomenon in comedy, but not unparalleled outside Menander: Alceste, Molière's *Misanthrope*, arouses our sympathy and we care little for the final arrangements made by the other characters after he withdraws to the desert; Malvolio, at the end of Shakespeare's *Twelfth Night*, curses the whole wedding party and forcefully reminds us of the injustice he has suffered.[8] If comedy is essentially a social genre, its form being the social convention of marriage, its function reconciliation, then certain of its leading characters are decidedly anti-comic: they stand in the way of marriage and refuse to be reconciled with those whom they despise. They are the individualists in a conforming world, the sources of energy in their plays, and we admire them. Knemon is certainly one of the best of these and rather than see his part as disproportionately large in a play of romance and intrigue, it should be seen as a fine example of Menander's manipulation of convention.

The end of the *Dyskolos* is a variation on another convention: just as comedy moves toward marriage and the beginning of a new life, it also moves toward a celebration of that new life participated in by all characters. Arch enemies are forgiven and everyone joins in for the drinking and dancing: in Plautus' *Rudens* even the pimp is invited by the father of the girl he was trying to prostitute; in Shakespeare's *Tempest* Prospero can forgive those who usurped his throne and tried to take his life. In the *Dyskolos*, however, Menander refuses to destroy his principal character by following convention; he cannot leave Knemon out of the *komos-gamos* finale, but he cannot have him change his whole way of life in an instant. He therefore sends on Sikon and Getas to force Knemon into the comic circle, a satisfying solution to the problem of the play but one which leaves the audience a bit uncomfortable about Knemon's future in that social situation.

Smikrines appears in the *Aspis*, *Epitrepontes*, *Sikyonios*, and perhaps in the *First Adelphoi* and Menander's original for Plautus' *Aulularia*.

[8] I am grateful to Terence Collins, who attended my comedy course at the University of Minnesota, for his observations on Malvolio and Knemon in particular, but on comic characters in general.

He is certainly a miser in the *Epitrepontes*, caring more for his daughter's dowry than for her happiness. Wilamowitz, however, has pointed out that he is far from being a "Typus"; he redeems himself in the arbitration scene and in his attacks upon the inconsiderate behavior of Charisios.[9] It is doubtful that Smikrines had an *apologia* speech in the complete play, but, unlike Knemon, he does not need such a speech to arouse sympathy for himself and his position in the matter of his daughter's treatment. The audience shares his outrage, and though he attacks Charisios for the wrong reason, he remains essentially on the right side. There are great ironies in the role, which Menander exploits to the fullest: Smikrines is constantly interfering in the problems of his daughter, trying to persuade her to leave her husband's house, and yet it is Smikrines who brings about the recognition of their child—he unknowingly decides the fate of his own grandchild—which leads to the final reconciliation between them; he is the first to show concern for his daughter's plight, but the last to know what it is all about. It is this quality of interference for the wrong reasons which highlights Smikrines' character; he is not evil, only misguided, and Menander manages to reverse all his bad intentions to good results. In this sense he is both the barrier figure in the play and a key to the solution of its problems. One cannot overlook the hyperbole and absurdity of much that he says, but he shares these qualities with Knemon, and one certainly takes Knemon seriously. I think, finally, one takes Smikrines seriously, too, if only in contrast to the triviality of the younger characters. Granted that Pamphile might have had a noble speech of self-sacrifice (510 ff. Körte), that Charisios shares with us his moment of self-revelation (588 ff. Körte) and that Habrotonon is a very clever girl—all these characters, not to mention the featherweight Chairestratos, have about them an aura of elusiveness and inconsequentiality: Pamphile might have said many things to persuade her father to leave her in her husband's house, but she obviously did not tell him the one thing which would have explained Charisios' abandonment of her—that she had borne a five-months' baby; Charisios' speech is mock-tragic and self-indulgent;[10] Habrotonon has her freedom to gain, as

[9] U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Das Schiedsgericht* (Berlin 1925) 137.

[10] Its tone is more like that of Chaireas' lament in the *Aspis* (284 ff. Austin) and Moschion's complaint in the *Perikeiromene* (276 ff. Körte) than like any straightforward,

Onesimos points out (381 ff. Körte). The only character who is completely motivated by principle is Smikrines, though that principle, miserliness, is base. The rest seem petty and selfserving by comparison, though they see themselves as serious, important people.

The end of the *Epitrepontes* presents a minor problem of reconstruction: is the confrontation between Smikrines and the slaves Onesimos and Sophrone the last scene of the play, or does a scene of reconciliation with Charisios and Pamphile follow?[11] Even if a reconciliation were actually staged, it would be a false one, like the end of the *Dyskolos*. Smikrines in the *Epitrepontes* is, like Knemon, a strong individual who remains outside the comic circle and has values opposed to the social conventions on which comedy depends. We respect him for his obstinance even while recognizing the perversity of his motivation, miserliness. In moving toward marriage—or remarriage, in this case—along with the rest of the characters, we find Smikrines of more interest than any of them.

Smikrines in the *Aspis* is Menander's closest approximation to a comic villain. He completely dominates the action of the play and it is his failure to achieve his miserly aims which the prologue Tyche tells us is the end of the action: "So having caused himself a lot of trouble and suffered much pain he will make known to all just what kind of man he is, and then return to his old ways" (143–46 Austin). Unlike Pan in the *Dyskolos* and Agnoia in the *Perikeiromene*, Tyche is not particularly interested in the marriages that will result; her major interest is Smikrines. If she had not intervened all would have proceeded

"serious" speech. No matter what the dramatic circumstances under which a young lover delivers an emotional speech—Chaireas truly believes Kleostratos dead and his love for Kleostratos' sister hopeless—the audience's certainty that all will turn out well for him, if he deserves it, makes such a speech slightly ludicrous. Charisios is a young lover, though married, and behaves and speaks according to type (cf. the young married lover in *Pap. Antinoopolis* 15). Perhaps, because he does, at least, have enough depth to be angry, we respond to him on a slightly different level than to most of his type; we are as pleased with his recognition of his error as we are with Polemon's and Thrasonides', but even in these cases there is something short of full sympathy, because love makes them all a bit ridiculous—Menander stylizes expression more under these circumstances than anywhere else.

[11] Webster (see above, note 1) 40: "The end of the play was occupied with the reconciliation of Smikrines and the liberation of Onesimos." (F. H. Sandbach (*PCPS* 193 = N.S. 13 [1967] 44 ff.) denies a speaking part to Sophrone.)

smoothly for the young lovers; the confusion she causes brings no good to them, only harm to Smikrines.

Daos, who is Smikrines' clever antagonist throughout the play, seems to be announcing to him the return of Kleostratos and the double marriage being arranged inside, in the last thirty or so line-ends, which are all that remain of the fifth act: "I will admit . . . the women are happy . . . inside . . . has drug . . . there will be a double marriage . . . his daughter . . . the sister . . . all the property . . . he will have everything" (516–24 Austin). There is a change of speaker, mention of a neighbor, an exchange of oaths, mention of Kleostratos and a feast and then four lines which could be given to either Daos or Smikrines: "This man is clearly . . . but if he beats him often . . . I'll make him *kosmiôteros* . . . somehow he is . . ." (536–39 Austin).[12] If Smikrines is speaking of Daos—making him more "agreeable"?—then he must still have hopes of getting some of the money, and the last few lines bear this out: ". . . the promise to keep this . . . in front of witnesses . . . to Chaireas whatever he wishes . . . since I, this property . . . bothering me" (540–44 Austin). On the other hand the lines about making someone *kosmiôteros* might be spoken by Daos in reference to Smikrines, in which case the *Aspis* has an ending parallel to that of the *Dyskolos* and

[12] Austin's text reads—

]εξων δῆλός ἐστιν οὗτοσί.
]αν τε κόπτηι πολλάκις
]υτωι κοσμιώτερον ποῶ
]ηρ ἐστί μοι τρόπον τινά.

Austin's commentary offers several helpful suggestions, including H. Lloyd-Jones' citation of the proverb *Φρὺξ ἀνὴρ πληγεὶς ἀμείνων καὶ διακονέστερος*. Daos has, of course, drawn attention to the fact that he is a Phrygian in an earlier exchange with Smikrines (206); he and the waiter then trade abuse on the subject of national characteristics (242 ff.). R. Sherk (*AJP* 91 [1970] 341 ff.) has noted the irony of Daos, a clever and faithful slave, being Phrygian, a nationality notorious for indigence. If Smikrines is speaking, then this irony is continued and the antagonism between the noble slave and the perverse old man comes to a climax in this final confrontation. On the other hand, there is support for the contention that Daos is speaking about Smikrines in the choice of *kosmios*, an adjective unsuitably applied to a slave, but perfect for the qualities which Knemon lacks. (Mette (*Hermes* 97 [1969] 432 ff.) has traced the significance of the word in the fourth century and pointed out its appropriateness in the *Samia*.) Turner suggests *ἀνήρ* in 539 and Sandbach fills out the line, e.g.: *σωφρονιστέος γὰρ ἀνήρ ἐστί μοι τρόπον τινά*, comparing *Dyskolos* 903 f.: *τὸ δ' ὅλον ἐστὶν ἡμῖν / ἄνθρωπος ἡμερωτέος* where Getas is planning with Sikon the ragging of Knemon.

of the *Epitrepontes*: an elaborate lesson in ethics and sociability given the old man by the slave.

It is difficult to have even grudging respect for Smikrines; he is so unrelievedly mean and nasty. There are certain hints in the text as to the causes of his perversity—he is poor and sees himself victimized by his rich brother Chairestratos (121, 126, 172 ff. Austin)—and in the complete play there might have been more, but the extreme nature of his miserliness and the fact that Tyche says he will return to his old ways, make it unlikely that there was even an attempt at reconciliation in the end.

Line 156 of the *Sikyonios* (Kassel) ends with the letters *ΣM* and a short gap; the vocative *Smikrinê* fits the meter and the sense. It is the opening of the fourth act and two men are arguing over the best way to decide an important question. Smikrines has just said that the only way to the truth is through discussion in a small group and his antagonist calls him an oligarch. Various abusive remarks are exchanged and then someone is accused of stealing (161 ff. Kassel).[13] This is the only reference in the play to money, other than the short unplaced fragment suggesting that Stratophanes was once poor and is now rich.[14] The plot of the play is quite clear, though certain details are still obscure: Stratophanes is the son of an Athenian but has been raised by a Sikyonian along with an Athenian girl stolen by pirates. The girl is part of the Sikyonian's property and after he dies, a Boeotian creditor claims her and takes her to Athens. Stratophanes arrives from military service

[13] I offer the following reconstruction of 161 ff. *exempli gratia*; it incorporates, in addition to supplements given in Kassel, suggestions made by Merkelbach (*MH* 23 [1966] 176) and Webster, who *per litt.* offered the reading of 166:

(ΣM.) ὄχλος ὢν δ' ὁμολόγ[ει, πονηρὲ σύ;
(?) οὐκ ἄν γένοιτο τοῦτ'. ἐγώ σε [νὴ Δία
τὸν πλούσιον κλέπτοντα σ[υναγαγεῖν λέγω
σκεύη τε καὶ τούτων ἀποτ[ακτὰ γειτόνων.
ἀργύριον οὐκ ἐξ οἰκίας ἴσως φ[έρεις,
τῶν ἀγομένων ἐκεῖσε, προ[σποεῖ δὲ σά.

Smikrines: Do you admit that you are one of the rabble, you good-for-nothing?
:Not at all, but I say that you, by god, a rich man, are a thief, that you confiscated the chattels and equipment of these your neighbors. You did not exactly steal money from their house, but you pretend that what they have is yours.

(Cf. A. Barigazzi (*SIFC* 37 [1965] 15 ff.) who reconstructs along more general lines.)

[14] Fr. 3 Kassel = Fr. 375 Körte: Στρατοφάνη, λιτόν ποτ' εἶχες χλαμύδιον καὶ παιδ' ἕνα.

in Asia Minor and learns the truth about his birth, but must find his father to prove his identity. He must also protect the girl from Moschion, the son of Smikrines, who has bought her from the Boeotian or in some other way come into control of her fate. Stratophanes is recognized as the son of Smikrines and the girl finds her father, too, so they can be married.[15] The only place for an accusation of stealing in this context would seem to be against Smikrines if he had been in league with the Boeotian to strip Stratophanes of his possessions; not only his adopted father's possessions would be forfeited but also any booty he himself had gathered in Asia Minor. Stratophanes might be making exactly that accusation against Smikrines in line 272 ff. (Kassel)—"I charge you with kidnapping"[16]—which precedes the recognition.

If this reconstruction is substantially correct, Smikrines in the *Sikyonios* is the victim of as much dramatic irony as is Smikrines in the *Epitrepontes*. Immediately after establishing himself as an oligarch he hears from a messenger an account of what has just happened at Eleusis: two young men laid claim to a slave girl, the one saying she was free and he would marry her as soon as he could prove they were

[15] Major contributions to the understanding of the play have been made by R. Kassel (*Menandri Sicyonius* [Berlin 1965] and *Eranos* 43 [1965] 1 ff.); E. Handley (*BICS* 12 [1965] 38 ff.); H. Lloyd-Jones (*Emerita* 34 [1966] 135 ff. and *GRBS* 7 [1966] 131 ff.); R. Merkelbach (*MH* 23 [1966] 172 ff.); H. J. Mette (*Gnomon* 37 [1965] 433 ff. and *Lustrum* 10 [1965] 169 ff.); and A. Barigazzi (see above, note 13) 7 ff. It is possible that Philoumene flees Stratophanes rather than Moschion; that she has not been sold to Moschion but is still in the possession of Stratophanes; there would then be a close parallel with the *Perikeiromene* where Glykera flees Polemon and does not consider Moschion a serious threat.

[16] *(ΣΤΡ. ?) τοὺς ἀνδραποδιστὰς ἀπαγαγεῖ[ν*
(ΣΜ. ?) ἡμᾶς σύ; (ΣΤΡ. ?) νὴ τὸν Ἥλιον. (ΣΜ.?) κορυβ[αντιαῖς,
μειράκιον; (ΣΤΡ. ?) ἐξαίφνης πολιτ[
γενναῖον οὐκ ἔξεστί μο[ι
(ΣΜ.) πῶς; ἀγνοῶ τὸ τοιοῦτο[
(ΣΤΡ.) ὁραῖς; βάδιζ' εἰς ἐξεταζ[
πρᾶγμ' ἐξεταζε[
παρὰ τῆς ἱερέα[ς

Stratophanes enters after the messenger departs and accuses Smikrines of being a kidnapper; he says that he could not prosecute Smikrines before but now as an Athenian citizen he will take him to court. In the meantime the girl is under the protection of the priestess. (Cf. Barigazzi [above, note 13] 37 ff., who thinks the accusation is made of Stratophanes.)

both Athenian, the other protesting the "tragical" quality of this assertion. The crowd believed the former and turned the girl over to the priestess for protection. The two young men are Smikrines' sons and the sort of crowd that he despises has reached a just verdict.[17]

Smikrines in the *Sikyonios*, then, is not only a man accused of theft and kidnapping—these accusations could stem from a reputation for miserliness and over-zealous business practices—but an oligarch, whom Theophrastos describes as "interested in gaining power, not money."[18] Perhaps all of this unpleasantness is summed up in the derisive epithet "brow-raiser" which Smikrines' adversary attaches to him (160 f. Kassel) and which seems to be a sign of general arrogance.[19] Such a description puts this Smikrines in line with the other two old men of the same name and, like them, he is clearly an impressive character, who, though working against the movement of the play, and representing unattractive personal traits, arouses our interest, perhaps more than the young people who will be married. The end of the play is badly preserved, but preparations are being made for the marriage of Stratophanes, and clearly Smikrines would take part; there would seem to be little cause for abuse by slaves, unless in some lost portion of the play Smikrines had offended Stratophanes' slaves as Knemon had Sostratos' in the *Dyskolos*.

Smikrines is probably the Menandrean original for Euclio in Plautus' *Aulularia*.[20] It is reasonable to suppose that Plautus broadened the outline of Menander's character, turning Smikrines into the caricature of a miser that Euclio is.[21] At the end of the play he was cured of

[17] The first few lines of the messenger speech recall the messenger speech in Euripides' *Orestes*. That play is violently anti-democratic and the unjust verdict against Orestes and Electra is reached in a full assembly, under the influence of shameless demogogues.

[18] Character 26: δόξειε δ' ἂν εἶναι ἡ ὀλιγαρχία τις, ἰσχύος, οὐ κέρδους γλιχομένη.

[19] Cf. Fr. 34 Körte (= Terence *Andria* 406) and Fr. 395 Körte. Quintilian (*Inst.* 11.3.79) sees the raised brow as a sign of agitation and vehemence.

[20] For an appreciation of Menandrean elements in the *Aulularia*, see W. Ludwig *Philologus* 106 (1962) 44 ff., 247 ff. The basic identification rests on a fragment of Choricius *Apol. Mim.*: Σμικρίνης δὲ φιλαργύρους [ἡμᾶς παρεσκεύασε εἶναι] ὁ δεδιὼς μή τι τῶν ἔνδον ὁ κάπνος οἴχοιτο φέρων (Körte 2.51), and its resemblance to *Aulularia* 300 f.:

> quin divom atque hominum clamat (Euclio) continuo fidem,
> de suo tigillo fumus si qua exit foras.

[21] E. Fraenkel (*Elementi Plautini in Plauto* [Florence 1960] 130 ff.) has shown that Plautus enlarged the dialogue between Megadorus and Euclio at 475 ff.—a scene which

his affliction and presumably gave the pot of gold as dowry with his daughter to Lyconides.[22]

The case for a Smikrines as original for Antipho in Plautus' *Stichus* (Menander's *First Adelphoi*) is based on the miserliness evident in his character:[23] he is more concerned for the poverty of his daughters' marriages than for their fidelity to their absent husbands. In this, of course, he resembles Smikrines in the *Epitrepontes*.[24] One can imagine a closing scene in Menander's play—replaced by Plautus with the slave revel which closes his play—wherein the old man is made to endure the sort of treatment by slaves which Smikrines suffers from Onesimos and Sophrone at the end of the *Epitrepontes*.

Kleainetos in the *Georgos* is living a life similar to Knemon's in the *Dyskolos*: he is separated from his wife, works very hard and depends upon no one. He, like Knemon, suffers injury in an accident and is saved by a noble youth named Gorgias. In gratitude he offers to marry the young man's sister Hedeia, but she is pregnant by another young man, probably a Moschion, who has been betrothed against his will to his own half-sister. As preparations for the two weddings are under way—Kleainetos' to Hedeia, "Moschion's" to his half-sister—Gorgias and Hedeia are recognized as children of Kleainetos by his

serves to characterize or caricature, both of them—and Ludwig (see above, note 20) 55 ff. has pointed out the Plautine expansion and exaggeration of jokes on Euclio's miserliness in the cook scene, 280 ff.

[22] Fr. IV Lindsay = Nonius 98:

nec noctu nec die quietus umquam eram; nunc dormiam.

[23] Mette (see above, note 1), in his discussion of stage setting, plot and motivation in the original of the *Stichus* (24, 36 f., 104), presumes that Plautus' Antipho was a Smikrines in Menander, though he lists only *Aspis*, *Epitrepontes* and the original of the *Aulularia* for Smikrines when considering characterization (22). There was also a *parcus senex* in Luscius Lanuvinus' *Thesaurus* (Donatus *ad* Terence, *Eunuchus* 10), which was probably based on the *Thesauros* of Menander. See C. Gaston, *AJP* 92 (1971) 17 ff. His argument for a *senex amator* in Menander's play, on the basis of Fr. 198 Körte, is unconvincing. That old men suffer in love is a *topos* going back at least as far as Euripides' *Aiolos* (Fr. 23N²). Should one argue on that basis that Aiolos lusted after his daughters? See W. T. MacCary, "Comic Structure and the Comic Tradition in Diphilos' *Kleroumenoi*," forthcoming in *Hermes*.

[24] Scholiast on Odyssey 8.225 f.: *κομιδὴ γὰρ σμικρολόγος φαίνεται προτάσσων τῶν φιλτάτων τὴν κτῆσιν, ὡς παρὰ Μενάνδρῳ Σμικρίνης ἐν Ἐπιτρέπουσιν.* Cf. Theophrastos, *Character* 10: *ἡ δὲ μικρολογία ἐστὶ φειδωλία τοῦ διαφόρου ὑπὲρ τὸν καιρόν.*

estranged wife Myrrhine. "Moschion" then marries Hedeia, Gorgias marries the half-sister and Kleainetos is reconciled with his wife.[25] It is important to distinguish between the simple plot of the *Dyskolos* and the complex plot of the *Georgos*: Knemon is the barrier to his daughter's marriage and is removed in the action of the play; the barrier to Hedeia's marriage with "Moschion" is her poverty and his father's other arrangements—Kleainetos' offer of marriage is a secondary problem. His role is similar to that of Megadorus in the *Aulularia* in that by creating another barrier between the young lovers he helps overcome the first. The offer which Kleainetos makes represents a significant change in his way of thinking, a new commitment to society, but he seems not to have changed in his essential distrust of other men, especially wealthy men of the city: "I am a country boor—even I will not deny it—and I am not perfectly acquainted with city ways, but time improves my knowledge (fr. 3 Körte) . . . he who has wronged you in your poverty is cursed by his injustice and will, perhaps, suffer in his turn; even though he is wealthy, there is no safety for him in his excess, for circumstances can swiftly change" (fr. 1 Körte).[26]

Kleainetos also appears in Körte's *Fabula Incerta*.[27] He is the father of a girl who has been raped by Moschion but is betrothed to Chaireas. There is some kind of intrigue, engineered by Chaireas and involving Kleainetos, to marry the girl to Moschion and give Moschion's sister to Chaireas; Laches, Moschion's father, is the victim of the intrigue, which would have been unnecessary had there not been money involved, as in the *Georgos*. Kleainetos was probably poor, perhaps again a farmer. He was not a willing party to the deception, but tricked into participating by Chaireas. There must have been more

[25] Webster (see above, note 1) 26–34, 47–50, reconstructs along these lines by analogy with the *Heros*.

[26] Neither of these book fragments can be assigned with certainty to Kleainetos, but both fit the description given of him by Daos in the papyrus fragments (42 ff. Körte). There is a similarity with the speech Gorgias makes to Sostratos in *Dyskolos* 271 ff., but Gorgias in the *Georgos* would not speak of "your" poverty, but "our" poverty.

[27] Nothing seems to connect the *Fabula Incerta* with the fragment of the *Koneiazomenai* except the name Chaireas, and we now know it from the *Dyskolos* and the *Aspis*, so it was not uncommon. For discussion and bibliography see Webster (above, note 1) 53 ff. and Mette (above, note 1) 148 ff.

complication to the plot; now it is difficult to see what sort of role Kleainetos played.

These three characters—Knemon, Smikrines and Kleainetos (at least in the *Georgos*)—play roles of essentially a barrier-type: they stand in between two young lovers, thus opposing the main movement of their plays toward marriage. They are, however, in each appearance, the dominating character. Often they have noble counterparts to point up their perversities—Gorgias in the *Dyskolos*, Daos in the *Aspis*. Although we do not always sympathize with their point of view, we do respect them because Menander never treats them like clowns, but always as real and affecting characters.

Demeas plays a barrier role in two plays, a friendly role in a third and an indeterminate role in a fourth. In all these plays he is primarily of interest as a father rather than for any idiosyncrasy such as miserliness or misanthropy. In the *Samia* our attention is focused on the relationship between Demeas and his adopted son Moschion throughout. Moschion's opening monologue sets up the major problem in the play: "He (Demeas) fell in love with a hetaira from Samos—a perfectly human thing to do, but he hid his love because he was ashamed. I found out about it against his will and argued with him; I told him that unless he took the girl for his mistress she would be surrounded and harassed by young lovers; but he was ashamed to do this because of me . . . It pains me to tell the rest; nevertheless . . . but I am ashamed. There's no help for it . . . nevertheless, I'm ashamed. The girl got pregnant . . . I am ashamed because of my father" (21–67 Austin). The two cases are parallel: the father is ashamed to admit his love for a hetaira to his son, and his son is ashamed to admit to his father that he had gotten a girl pregnant. This mutual lack of trust is never a barrier to the marriage between Moschion and the girl he wronged—Demeas is anxious for the match before he knows anything about Moschion's child by Plangon—but does cause Demeas to expel Chrysis, the Samian, on the assumption that the child is Moschion's by her. Moschion is never able to confront Demeas with the truth, so Demeas believes of him much worse than the truth. When all is straightened out and the marriage is finally to take place, Moschion throws up a phony barrier himself: to punish his father for believing him capable of having relations with Chrysis, he will pretend to leave

home for military service in Asia Minor. Demeas' reaction puts him in the position of making the final moral statement in the play: "Do not remember this one day on which I wronged you, forgetting all the rest" (709–10 Austin). Demeas is willing to accept his share of the blame, and to ignore the share that Moschion deserves, to hasten preparations for the marriage. This treatment of the misunderstandings between youth and age is typical of many of Menander's plays: the young man will have been stupid and devious and wrong,[28] but is rewarded with the desired marriage, while the old man—perverse, perhaps, or ignorant, but always straightforward, and acting in a manner consistent with a certain set of principles—must pretend to learn a lesson from his son. Our sympathies cannot but lie with the old man.

Demeas does not appear in the recently published fragments of the *Dis Exapaton*,[29] but his presence in the play is attested by a citation in Fulgentius.[30] Plautus has changed the name to Nicobulus in his

[28] Mette (above, note 20) praises Moschion for being *kosmios*—Moschion refers to himself as such (18 Austin) and Demeas calls him that twice (278, 344 Austin)—but this should perhaps be interpreted with the irony of double significance: he shows such reticence, such caution, that he is incapable of action when action is important and when he does act it is in adolescent excess. (Cf. Hesiod *Works and Days* 317 ff.; Euripides *Hippolytos* 385 ff. for the double significance of *aidôs*.) Moschion is really too old for this kind of behavior; he must be in his late twenties if he has already served as *chorêgos* and *phylarch* (13 ff. Austin). Perhaps the point here is that the relationship between Demeas and Moschion is not in that stage where the one is an authoritarian adult and the other a submissive adolescent, but should have been the kind of balanced friendship between father and son that comes when the latter approached middle age. Demeas seems to have taken Moschion's advice on making Chrysis mistress of his household; presumably Moschion showed enough maturity at that point to convince Demeas that he would not be setting a bad example for an impressionable young man. Yet he behaves throughout the play as would the most unprincipled and immoderate youth. His speeches in condemnation of Demeas are full of self-righteous clichés, as are most attempts at seriousness by young lovers in Menander (see especially the speech on noble men and bastards [135 ff. Austin], a strange topic for the adopted Moschion to wax oratorical on). It is Demeas who takes careful deliberation with himself, draws logical, though mistaken, conclusions from the evidence and acts carefully—he feigns the violence with which he casts out Chrysis. Again, the old man is treated with more seriousness than the young man; all the mistakes Demeas makes are out of concern for his son, whereas the mistakes of the son are selfish and conventional.

[29] E. W. Handley, *Menander and Plautus: A Study in Comparison* (London 1968).

[30] *βουληφόρως*
τὴν ἡμετέραν, ὦ Δημέα, προκατέλαβες
ὄρασιν. (Fr. 109 Körte)

Bacchides and must have changed the character a great deal too. It has been shown that in various plays Menander uses old men as barriers to young love, causes them to be riduled by slaves in the end, and yet after all of this, the old men remain impressive, respected, even sympathetic characters. It is possible that this was true in the *Dis Exapaton*: Demeas and Menander's original for Plautus' Philoxenus were ridiculed by the courtesans in the last scene, perhaps with the sheep analogy which Plautus so greatly expands,[31] but they retained their dignity. Like Knemon in the *Dyskolos* and Smikrines in the *Epitrepontes* they were forced to join festivities which they had opposed at the start, but unlike Nicobulus and Philoxenus in Plautus,[32] they did not yield in spirit—

Fulgentius comments (*Myth.* 3.1.199), "*Bellerophonta posuerunt, quasi βουληφοροῦντα—nam et Menander similiter in Disexapatonte comoedia ita ait: βουληφόρως—ὅρασιν id est: consiliarie nostram, Demea, praeoccupavisti visionem.* Webster (see above, note 1, 86 f.) finds no suitable place for this line in Plautus' *Bacchides*, so considers the possibility of Fulgentius' having confused two old men who are twice deceived, and aligns it with Terence, *Adelphi* 385 ff.:

> o Demea,
> istuc est sapere, non quod ante pedes modost
> videre sed etiam illa quae futura sunt
> prospicere.

The two passages are not exactly parallel and Fulgentius' point about the confusion between Bellerophon and *βουληφορῶν* brings to mind Plautus' *Bacchides* 810 f.:

> aha, Bellorophantam tuo' me fecit filius:
> egomet tabellas tetuli ut vincirer. sine.

In Terence Syrus is speaking to Demea; in Plautus Chrysalus is speaking to Nicobulus. The new *Dis Exapaton* fragments show that Chrysalus' part was taken by Syros in Menander; Nicobulus could have been Demeas.

[31] See Fraenkel (above, note 21) 68 ff., 374.

[32] Philoxenus yields to the enticements of the courtesans, but Nicobulus agrees to enter their house only when they promise that half of his swindled money will be returned. G. Williams (*Hermes* 84 [1956] 446 ff.) believes that this motif is original with the *Dis Exapaton* but that Plautus has added it to the original of the *Pseudolus*. E. Leach (*Hermes* 97 [1969] 331) points out a similar motif in the *Mostellaria*—all the money will be returned—and sees it as the culmination of a rather subtle piece of Plautine characterization. In all three plays there are two elements which are unparalleled in Menander: the clever slave who has contempt for his master and the old man whose principles are compromised for money. In addition, the *Bacchides* has a *senex libidinosus*, a type which is also unparalleled in Menander. Of course, the fragments of Menander do not offer a relatively complete play of the kind which depends upon courtesans, i.e., where there are special opportunities for an old man to make a fool of himself over sex and money, so to this dubious argument from silence should be added the slightly stronger argument

they were not dirty old men who look forward to sharing their sons' mistresses, but harassed fathers who are made to compromise their strict standards and support their sons' amorous arrangements, much against their will.

Demeas has a part in the *Imbrioi*, since he is addressed in Fr. 212 Körte. A *periocha* survives (*P.Oxy.* 1235) which provides some information on the plot: two friends, who were poor, lived together at Imbros and married two sisters; they continued to live together afterwards, worked hard and became rich. Fr. 212 Körte must be one of those friends addressing the other. Fr. 213 Körte is a son speaking to his father on the importance of *logismos*. It seems, then, that the action of the play takes place during the adolescence of the friends' children; Demeas might have been a barrier to his son's plans for marriage and had to endure a lecture by him, like Sostratos' to Kallippides (*Dyskolos* 797 ff.).[33]

Demeas is the father of two long-lost children in the *Misoumenos*; his daughter Krateia has become the mistress of a soldier, Thrasonides, and his son Kleinias lives next door to the soldier. Demeas might be considered a temporary barrier between Krateia and Thrasonides in that Thrasonides suspects him of being a rival lover (216 ff. Turner) but this is a very minor complication. The major problem in the play is Krateia's refusal to accept her status as mistress—she might even be a slave[34]—in Thrasonides' house. This Demeas corrects by recognizing

that Plautus took greater freedom with his originals late in his career when all the great slave plays were written. Then, too, there are the brief and self-contained changes or additions which can be fairly convincingly documented; when such passages are shown to be essential to the conception of a Plautine character—as with Euclio above and Philoxenus and Nicobulus here—then one is justified in speaking in terms of significant Plautine originality in characterization.

[33] Webster (see above, note 1) 65, note 5, compares the *Second Adelphoi*: "Both men had been too poor in their youth to enjoy themselves, but had then become well-to-do. Micio followed the town life of soft irresponsibility, Demea the hard life of agriculture and family cares. Demea is 'thrifty' by nature and not only because he is old. He educated his son by fear and by precepts." It is tempting to see a Demeas of Menander in the Demea of Terence's *Adelphi*, as does Webster (see above, note 30). Like Demeas in the *Dis Exapaton*, he is the harsh father who yields to his sons' demands not out of conviction but through force. There is no evidence, however, that Terence ever used the names of his original unchanged.

[34] This she would have in common with Philoumene in the *Sikyonios*. The crises which have precipitated Philoumene's flight to the altar at Eleusis (see above, note 15) and Krateia's rejection of Thrasonides—corresponding to Glykera's departure from Polemon after the title scene of the *Perikeiromene*—cannot be reconstructed.

her as his free-born daughter, and marrying her to Thrasonides. The *Misoumenos* is one of several plays in which the old man becomes an aid in the resolution of the central problem, when one of the young men is primarily responsible for that problem; the *Epitrepontes* and the *Perikeiromene* are others.[35]

Laches appears in five plays and like Demeas is always primarily of interest for his role as father. Like Demeas in the *Samia* his problem is usually ignorance. In the *Heros* he discovers that his wife had given birth to a boy and girl before their marriage, and then, like Charisios in the *Epitrepontes*, finds out that he was the father. In the meantime he has agreed to marry his unrecognized daughter to a slave, which seems to be the major complication in the play. She has been raped by the boy next door, who marries her after the recognition. In the *Fabula Incerta* Laches is tricked by Chaireas into marrying his son Moschion to Kleainetos' daughter, and his daughter to Chaireas. In the *Kitharistes* Moschion tries to trick his father Laches into agreeing to his marriage with a girl whom he has raped. In the *Perinthia* Laches is the object of a deception similar to that in the *Fabula Incerta*. In the *Plokion* Laches is his son Moschion's ally against his wife Krobyle's plan to marry Moschion to one girl when he has already raped another. Laches could be considered a barrier figure in the *Heros*, *Fabula Incerta*, *Perinthia* and *Kitharistes*, but not of the same type as Knemon and Smikrines: his opposition to the proposed marriages is not due to a particular perversity on his part, but to the conviction that he knows what is best for his children even when he does not know all he should about what his children have been up to. He is prone to violence—abusing Myrrhine in the *Heros*, threatening to burn Daos in the *Perinthia* and attacking Kleainetos in the *Fabula Incerta*—but neither this trait nor his role as the object of deception seems to have been caricatured by Menander. Indications are that Laches always emerged as the mistaken but respected parent.

Nikeratos, appearing only in the *Samia*, is also the victim of ignorance; his daughter has borne a baby and he is the last to know. When he understands Demeas' suspicion that Demeas' son has slept with Demeas' mistress Chrysis, Nikeratos launches into a tirade of mythic parallels that provides the climax to a very funny scene. Later, when

[35] See MacCary (above, note 4).

Nikeratos has realized the baby is his daughter's, Demeas cites mythic parallels, such as Danaë, to suggest that a god is responsible. Webster has noted a contrast between the contemplative Demeas and the violently active Nikeratos.[36] They do differ in important respects: Demeas is rich, Nikeratos poor; Demeas seems to be quick-witted, while Nikeratos is a bit slow—their opening exchange on the quality of air and life in Athens and Pontos illustrates this, as well as the length of time it takes Nikeratos to grasp the significance of Demeas' suspicions against Moschion, and the seriousness with which he first entertains the possibility that his daughter has been favored by a god; most important, perhaps, is Nikeratos' genuine violence when he realizes what Moschion has done (he will burn the baby), compared with Demeas' feigned violence in expelling Chrysis from his house.

Pataikos in the *Perikeiromene*, his only appearance, is the epitome of the helpful friend of the young lover; he counsels Polemon wisely, urging moderation while the slave Sosias encourages violence. He is recognized as Glykera's father, just as Demeas is recognized as Krateia's father in the *Misoumenos*. The role which Micio plays in Terence's *Adelphi* was played by Lamprias in Menander's *Second Adelphoi*.[37] As the overly lenient father and friend of the young lovers, he is made to see the excesses to which his philosophy can lead. Chairestratos, appearing in three plays, seems to be an exception to Menander's rule of consistency of characterization by name and role; he is a young lover in the *Epitrepontes* and *Eunouchos*, but in the *Aspis* he is Smikrines' younger brother and the father of a marriageable daughter. As the sympathetic stepfather of the young lover Chaireas, he is overwhelmed by the imminent prospect of Smikrines' marrying his niece, to whom Chaireas had been betrothed, but is urged on to defensive action by the slave Daos.

It is convenient to consider together the roles of Kallippides in the *Dyskolos*, Kichesias in the *Sikyonios* and Simo in the *Eunouchos*, since all are confined to action late in their plays. Kallippides makes an appearance at the end of the fourth act of the *Dyskolos* and his dialogue

[36] T. B. L. Webster, *Greek Theatre Production*[2] (London 1970) 76. Douglass Parker has pointed out to me a similar contrast in Terence's *Adelphi*, between the choleric Demea—he always enters on the point of eruption—and the benign Micio.

[37] Fr. 8 Körte = Terence, *Adelphi* 605 ff. See also Fr. 307 Körte, which suggests a role for Lamprias in the *Orge*.

with Sostratos opens the fifth. He pretends to be educated by his son on the capriciousness of fortune and the proper use of wealth and accepts poor marriages not only for Sostratos but for Sostratos' sister as well. The young man's speeches are cliché-ridden and the way in which Kallippides acquiesces is one of Menander's more subtle treatments of a general theme: age will yield to youth not out of conviction but from the lack of energy to go on resisting.

Kichesias first appears in the fifth act of the *Sikyonios*: in a very lively scene (343 ff. Kassel) the parasite Theron tries to convince Kichesias to take part in an intrigue which will enable Stratophanes to marry Philoumene. Kichesias is much offended at the suggestion and refuses; in the dialogue which follows his identity as Philoumene's real father is established.

Donatus establishes Simo as the father of the two young lovers in Menander's *Eunouchos* in his comment on Terence, *Eunuchus* 971. He is not involved in a recognition, but his arrival late in the play is necessary for a satisfactory resolution to the problems inherent in the two affairs; he must consent to the marriage of one son to a free-born girl, whom the son has violated, and agree to support the other son's liaison with a courtesan.

Each of these old men serves as a sort of comic *deus ex machina* coming on at the last moment to solve problems which would otherwise prevent the desired marriages. One finds similar roles in Plautus' *Poenulus* and Terence's *Andria*. In the former, which was thought by many to be based on Menander's *Karchedonios* until new fragments of the Greek play were published recently,[38] Hanno, like Kichesias, is asked to masquerade as himself. Crito arrives late in the action of the *Andria*, to effect a recognition that will lead on to marriage; his name in Menander is unknown. In fr. 5 (Körte) of the *Theophoroumene* the phrase *ἀπὸ μηχανῆς θεὸς ἐπεφάνης* must mean that someone comes on at the end to recognize the enchanted girl.[39]

Phanias has the title role in the *Kitharistes*; he is rich and his daughter is finally married to Moschion, who, presumably, has raped her.

Moschion, at the end of the *Perikeiromene* (446 f. Körte), is betrothed

[38] On the relation between the *Poenulus* and Menander's *Karchedonios*, see MacCary (above, note 4).

[39] Webster (see above, note 1) 52.

to the daughter of Philinos. Some have compared this situation to that in Terence's *Heauton Timoroumenos*, where Clitipho is simply married off to some available young woman to keep him out of trouble. Webster, however, reconstructs an important part for Philinos, as Myrrhine's husband, instrumental in bringing about the recognition.[40] Philinos is also listed as a character in *Pap. Antinoopolis* 15, which might come from the *Apistos*.[41] Kratinos is listed there, too, and could be an old man.

Kraton appears in the *Theophoroumene* and the *Androgynos*; Plutarch, who quotes two lines from the long speech which appears as *Theophoroumene* fr. 1 Körte, calls Kraton "the old man in comedy."[42] He is, then, probably the father of either Lysias or Kleinias, the two young men in the play.[43] His speech on the injustice of good men faring badly sounds much like Knemon's *apologia* in the *Dyskolos* and Kleainetos' observations on the poor man's hard fate in the *Georgos*. Kraton is addressed by someone in the *Androgynos* who swears by "Zeus god of friendship" (Fr. 49 Körte).

Straton is the *nauklêros* in Menander's play of that name; he is also an old man in the *Encheiridion*, as is Derkippos.[44]

Blepes, a name which is emended into the text of the *Sikyonios* (188 Kassel) by Sandbach and Thierfelder, if accepted, belongs to the messenger, who could be an old man.[45]

Several points can be made on the basis of this brief survey, though each is only tentative since the material is incomplete and much is reconstruction. The most striking is the strength and originality of Menander's old men. Though some are perverse and some are deceived, all maintain their dignity and many dominate the action of

[40] *Ibid.* 5 ff.

[41] Antinoopolis 15 and Berlin 13892 have been joined on the basis of common names by some scholars. Mette (above, note 1) 180 has bibliography. J. W. B. Barns and H. Lloyd-Jones (*JHS* 84 [1964] 21 ff.) reject the argument for joining. C. Austin (*CR* 17 [1967] 134) reads *ΤΟΣ* as the last three letters of the title on the Antinoopolis fragment and points out that *Apistos* is the only Menandrean title which ends in these letters.

[42] *Quaes. conv.* 9.5.1.

[43] There is a mosaic from Mytilene showing Act II in which Parmeno, the slave, is flanked by two young men named Kleinias and Lysias. (S. Charitonidis, L. Kahil, R. Ginouvès, *Les mosaiques de la maison du Ménandre à Mytilène* (= *Antike Kunst*, Beiheft 6) (Berlin 1970) 46, Plate 6.

[44] *Ibid.* 49, Plate 4.

[45] The messenger in the *Orestes* is an old man. See above, note 25.

their plays. One misses the arrogant stupidity of Plautus' old men, who are so consistently made fools of by their slaves. There seems, in fact, to be a direct relation between the nature of the two roles in the two authors. Menander has no slaves of the *gloriosus* type who dominate Plautus' masterpieces—the *Bacchides*, *Pseudolus* and *Mostellaria*,[46] while Plautus has few, if any, dominant old men like Knemon and Smikrines. It seems that the enlargement of the slave part in Plautus demanded a change in the nature of the old men who were the slave's adversaries.

In the plays of Plautus which are known to be taken from Menandrean originals—*Cistellaria*, *Bacchides*, *Stichus*, *Aulularia*—one does find an amorous old man, two foolish old fathers who are more concerned with sex and money than with their sons' morals, and two misers, one of whom is also amorous. Since there is no hint of a *senex libidinosus* in Menander or in adaptations of his plays by Terence, one wonders about Plautine changes in Alcesimarchus' father, Nicobulus and Philoxenus, and Antipho.[47] The two most completely developed characters of this type are Lysidamus in the *Casina* and Demipho in the *Mercator*, their plays being based on originals by Diphilos and Philemon. Because one thinks of these two contemporaries of Menander as having, in general, depended more on the stereotypical characters of Middle Comedy than did Menander himself,[48] perhaps one can attribute to their inspiration Plautus' denigration of old men in this respect.

In comparison to Terence's old men, Menander's seem, if anything,

[46] See W. T. MacCary, *Servus Gloriosus: A Study of Military Imagery in Plautus* (Diss. Stanford, 1969 = DA 2000-A (Nov. 1969) 190 ff., and above, note 3, 292 f.).

[47] The licentiousness of Alcesimarchus' father and Antipho is purely gratuitous, having no relation to any other aspect of their characters and no influence on the development of the plots of their plays. The same is essentially true of Nicobulus and Philoxenus, except that there is the symmetry between their seduction and that of Pistoclerus in the first scene, which many critics have been anxious to attribute to Menander (U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Neue Jahrbucher* 3 [1899] 517; Fraenkel [see above, note 23] 68 ff.; Webster [see above, note 1] 131 f.). What connects the two scenes is the recurrence of an image pattern more than the development of a theme—the lovers describe themselves as caught in birdlime (50, 1158 f.), urged on by goads (64, 1159) and in bondage to the mistress (92 f., 1205 f.)—and this is more characteristic of Plautus than of Menander. (See MacCary (above, note 45) and J. Svendsen, *Goats and Monkeys: A Study of Animal Imagery in Plautus* (Diss: University of Minnesota, 1971) *passim*.)

[48] T. B. L. Webster, *Studies in Later Greek Comedy*[2] (Manchester 1970) 151, 171.

more perverse, but this might be an accident of preservation. Menedemos, though supposedly withdrawn from society, is no match for the anti-social type Menander presents in Knemon and Smikrines. In all of Terence's plays the emphasis is on the relations between a father and his son rather than on any personal trait of a particular old man; Demea comes closest to having a complete philosophy rather than just a few ideas on education. In general Terence seems to have followed Menander closely in his treatment of old men,[49] avoiding caricature and ridicule, but to have lost some of the vitality of his originals.[50] It is perhaps in his handling of dialogue—compare the conversations between Demeas and Nikeratos in the *Samia*, to those between Demea and Micio in the *Adelphi*—that one notices most often a leveling of all characters, a reduction to a common standard of speech[51] and thought, where characters become spokesmen for points of view rather than complex mixtures of conflicting ideas and motivations.

On the consistency of characterization by name among old men, it can only be said that certain old men with leading roles tend to turn up again and again—Knemon is an exception—but the lesser characters do not: Smikrines is always a miser and Kleainetos is twice a poor farmer; Demeas and Laches are always primarily of interest with respect to their roles as fathers rather than through some aspect of their personality. Beyond that most old men seem to be unique, with characters such as Kallippides and Pataikos appearing only once.

Most significant in Menander's use of old men is their function in the different plays. When they are used as barriers between young lovers that must be removed before the play can conclude in marriage, they often become more interesting than that conclusion. They can acquiesce in the entreaties of their sons and daughters, but usually the audience is impressed both with the abstract and trivial quality of youth's proposition and with the specificity and stability of the position

[49] On Terence's fidelity to his originals in other respects, see W. Ludwig, *GRBS* 9 (1968) 169 ff.

[50] Terence's lack of *vis comica* was commented on by Caesar, who called him *dimidiate Menander*. See Duckworth (above, note 1) 385, note 4, and MacCary (above, note 3) 281 f.

[51] But see A. G. Arnott, *Greece and Rome* 17 (1970) 32 ff., who is impressed by the variety of Phormio's diction, and its difference from that of other characters in the *Phormio*.

taken by age. Menander's old men serve as reminders that special circumstances create individual problems, that universal statements cover no one man completely. In other words, they do what old men should do, and that is to check the simplistic enthusiasm and the moral absolutism of youth: what is impressive, however, is that they do this symbolically, within the structure of the plays, as well as incidentally, in their philosophical pronouncements. The young lovers want marriage and a new life; they will say anything and do anything to get what they want—condemn their fathers, praise their mistresses, trust their parasites. The old men cannot understand this urge to create, and often they are philosophically or financially opposed to the union. We know that age must yield, that comedy requires marriage and a new beginning, but what Menander shows us is that this is no uncomplicated process, that just because youth consistently prevails does not mean that age is consistently foolish. This sort of complexity is essential to Menander's art and in order to appreciate it his plays must be constantly compared to plays by other poets and to each other.